

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 17, 2005. Claims 1-20 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-20 were rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 18 have been amended to overcome the rejections outlined in the Office Action. No claims have been canceled or added. Applicants assert that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and examination in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,205,214, Culli et al. (hereinafter Culli) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,899, Moss et al. (hereinafter Moss) and further in view of Ushiki et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,940,378 (hereinafter Ushiki et al.). Applicants respectfully submit that Culli in view of Moss and Ushiki does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, and 18.

**Claim 1**

Applicants' amended claim 1 is drawn to a system for routing an AIN call made from a calling line resold to a carrier. The system comprises, among other features, a switch coupled to the resold line, the switch being operative to determine at the switch whether the AIN call is from the resold line and to route the call to a hub without any query to a service control point based on determining the call is from the resold line. Thus, all resold AIN calls received at the switch are routed to the hub without any prior query to an SCP.

The Office Action acknowledges that neither Culli nor Moss discloses whether a call is from a resold line without querying an SCP. However, the Office Action relies on Ushiki to resolve the deficiencies of Culli in view of Moss. The Office Action goes on to state "if a call is not an AIN call, the associated SCP is not queried..." (See Office Action page 5, line 11). However, if the call is an AIN call, the Office Action states "the operation of any AIN system is always the same i.e., that an SSP acting on a trigger queries an SCP which responds with appropriate call routing instructions. (See Office Action page 4, last 3 lines). Ushiki discloses that all intelligent network (IN) processing involves an SCP. (See Ushiki, column 1, lines 50-55 regarding IN call processing ). The Office Action does not address the recited feature of claim 1,

where the AIN call is routed to the hub without any query to an SCP. The Office Action only asserts that it would have been obvious to allow for an SSp to determine whether a call is from a resold line without querying an SCP, not routing.

The Office Action also asserts that it is notoriously well known in the AIN telephony arts that functionality can be shifted to move from certain AIN elements to other AIN elements. Applicants traverse this assertion and respectfully request support for the assertion of shifting of routing functionality from one AIN element to an AIN element at the time of the invention. Thus, it is clear that neither, Culli, Moss, nor Ushiki alone, or in combination, disclose a switch routing an AIN call to a hub or SSP without querying an SCP first. Therefore, Applicants' amended claim 1 is allowable over Culli in view of Moss.

#### Claim 9

Applicants' amended claim 9 is drawn to, a system, in an intelligent network, for routing an AIN call made from a calling line resold to a carrier. The system comprises, among other features, a first network element operative, without querying any service control points, to determine at the first network element whether an AIN call is from the calling line resold to the carrier and to route the call to a second network element operative to launch a query based on determining the call is from the calling line resold to the carrier. As described above with respect to amended claim 1, neither Culli, Moss, nor Ushiki alone or in combination teach or suggests a network element operative, without querying any service control points, to both determine whether a call is from a resold line and route the call to a second network element operative to launch a query. Neither reference alone, or in combination, discloses routing an AIN call to a hub without an SCP being queried first. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 9 is also allowable over Culli in view of Moss and Ushiki.

#### Claim 18

Applicants' amended claim 18 is drawn to a method for routing an AIN call made from a calling line resold to a service provider. The method comprises, among other features, (1) routing the call to a switch wherein the switch is operative to determine without querying any service control points whether the AIN call is made from the calling line resold and whether to route the call to a service switching point and (2) routing the call from the switch to the service

switching point in response to the switch determining, without querying any service control points, that the call is made from the calling line resold.

As described above with respect to amended claims 1 and 9, neither Culli Moss, nor Ushiki alone or in combination teach or suggests routing an AIN call from a switch to a service switching point in response to the switch determining, without querying any service control points, that the call is made from a resold calling line. Neither reference alone, or in combination, discloses routing an AIN call to a hub without an SCP being queried first. Thus, Applicants' amended claim 18 is also allowable over Culli in view of Moss and Ushiki.

#### Dependent Claims

At least because claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-20 respectfully inherit the language of amended claims 1, 9, and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 10-17 and 19-20 are also allowable over Culli in view of Moss and Ushiki for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claims 1, 9, and 18.


#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: December 19, 2005

By:   
Murrell W. Blackburn  
Reg. No. 50,881

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5041

